

\*\*\*\*\***DRAFT MINUTES**\*\*\*\*\*

Alexandria Board of Architectural Review  
Old & Historic Alexandria District

**Wednesday, July 25, 2012**

7:30pm, City Council Chambers, City Hall  
301 King Street, Alexandria, Virginia 22314

Members Present: Tom Hulfish, Chairman  
Oscar Fitzgerald, Vice Chairman  
Wayne Neale  
John von Senden  
Chip Carlin

Members Absent: Art Keleher  
Peter Smeallie

Staff Present: Planning & Zoning  
Al Cox, FAIA, Historic Preservation Manager  
Catherine Miliaras, Historic Preservation Planner  
Faroll Hamer, Director  
Barbara Ross, Deputy Director  
Tom Canfield, City Architect

The meeting was called to order at 7:37 p.m. by Chairman Hulfish.

---

## **I. MINUTES**

Consideration of the [minutes](#) of the public hearing of July 11, 2012.

**BOARD ACTION: Approved as submitted, 5-0.**

On a motion by Mr. Neale, seconded by Mr. von Senden, the minutes were approved, as submitted, 5-0.

---

## **II. CONSENT ITEMS**

Items on the Consent Calendar are those where the applicant has agreed to all conditions of approval shown in the staff reports. Without objection, the staff recommendation for these cases will be approved as a group by unanimous consent of the Board at the beginning of the meeting. When announced by the Chairman, any member of the Board or of the public may ask that one of these cases be removed for full discussion.

### **1. CASE BAR2012-0148**

Request for alterations at **614 S Saint Asaph St**

**APPLICANT:** Michael Dyke

**BOARD ACTION: This item was moved to Discussion Items.**

2. [CASE BAR2012-0198](#)  
Request for signage & alterations at **277 S Washington St**  
APPLICANT: EagleBank by Jeffery Stoiber  
BOARD ACTION: **Approved as submitted on the Consent Calendar, 5-0.**
3. [CASE BAR2012-0205](#)  
Request for alterations **119 N Washington St**  
APPLICANT: Jemal's First Federal LLC by Kathleen O'Hearn  
BOARD ACTION: **This item was moved to Discussion Items.**
4. [CASE BAR2012-0230](#)  
Request for alterations at **513 S Royal St**  
APPLICANT: Dina Shaher  
BOARD ACTION: **Approved as submitted on the Consent Calendar, 5-0.**
5. [CASE BAR2012-0231](#)  
Request for alterations at **109 Cameron Mews**  
APPLICANT: Karen Boyd  
BOARD ACTION: **Approved as submitted on the Consent Calendar, 5-0.**

On a motion by Mr. Carlin, seconded by Dr. Fitzgerald, the Consent Calendar was approved, 5-0.

---

### **III. DISCUSSION ITEMS**

1. [CASE BAR2012-0148](#)  
Request for alterations at **614 S Saint Asaph St**  
APPLICANT: Michael Dyke  
BOARD ACTION: **Approved as submitted, 5-0.**

#### **SPEAKERS**

Lynn Simarski and Guy Guthridge, owners at 612 South Saint Asaph Street, expressed concern about the proposal and spoke in opposition.

Rick Klaussen, speaking on behalf of the owners at 612 South Saint Asaph Street, proposed an alternate scheme.

Mr. Dyke, the applicant, spoke in support of the application.

#### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

Mr. Neale noted that louvered panels could be added to the porch to add privacy but found the proposal acceptable.

Mr. von Senden found the revised drawings to be an improvement.

On a motion by Dr. Fitzgerald, seconded by Mr. Carlin, the revised application was approved, as submitted, 5-0.

### **REASON**

The Board found the revised scheme adequately addressed their previous concerns regarding the quality of the application drawings, the architectural character of the proposed deck and the neighbor's privacy concerns.

3. **CASE BAR2012-0205**

Request for alterations **119 N Washington St**

APPLICANT: Jemal's First Federal LLC by Kathleen O'Hearn

BOARD ACTION: **Approved as submitted, 4-1.**

### **SPEAKERS**

Kathleen O'Hearn, representing the applicant, spoke in support of the application.

Poul Hertel, local resident, compared an image of a Hopper painting he distributed to the present-day view of the same house in order to provide an example of a building whose character had been adversely eroded by the cumulative effect of changes over time.

### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

Mr. Neale expressed great admiration for the building and thought that it would be a significant loss to lose the muntins on the existing bay window.

Dr. Fitzgerald found the proposed scheme to be an improvement.

Chairman Hulfish noted that the building had been vacant for years in part because the existing window mullions blocked views of the interior and made leasing difficult.

Mr. Carlin agreed with Dr. Fitzgerald and noted the example of how the windows at 326 King Street were now being opened up to improve the visibility of retail displays.

On a motion by Mr. Carlin, seconded by Mr. von Senden, the application was approved as submitted, 4-1 (with Mr. Neale voting in opposition).

### **REASON**

The Board generally found the proposed alteration of the store window to be appropriate and compatible with the building and the memorial character of the Parkeay.

6. **CASE BAR2012-0101**

Request to partially demolish and capsulate at **804 Duke St**

APPLICANT: Jack Ezzell by Gene R. Lewis, Lewis & Associates

BOARD ACTION: **Approved as amended, by a roll call vote, 5-0.**

The Board combined Docket Items 6 & 7 for discussion purposes.

7. **CASE BAR2012-0102**

Request for an addition at **804 Duke St**

APPLICANT: Jack Ezzell by Gene R. Lewis, Lewis & Associates

BOARD ACTION: **Approved as amended, by a roll call vote, 5-0.**

**SPEAKERS**

Ray Lewis, representing the applicant, spoke in support of the application and responded to questions.

Poul Hertel, local resident, expressed concern about the staff comment that changing a window to a door was easily reversible.

**BOARD DISCUSSION**

Mr. von Senden found the proposed scheme to be acceptable except had a concern regarding the pyramidal roof on the elevator shaft. He recommended a simpler shed roof at this location. The architect believed that the roof could be adequately flashed and waterproofed but agreed to restudy the roof form.

Mr. Carlin supported the staff recommendation.

Without further Board discussion, on a motion by Mr. Carlin, seconded by Mr. Neale, the Board voted to approve the application as amended, 5-0, by a roll call vote.

**REASON**

The Board found the proposed demolition and rear elevator addition to be appropriate.

8. **CASE BAR2012-0229**

Request for alterations at **662 S Columbus St**

APPLICANT: Michael & Sharon Mohr by Duncan W. Blair

BOARD ACTION: **Denied, 3-2.**

**SPEAKERS**

Duncan Blair, representing the applicant, spoke in support of the application and suggested that approval in this particular case would not necessarily set a precedent.

Robin Juni, speaking on behalf of the Washington Square Condominium Unit Owners' Association Board of Directors, spoke in opposition to the request and stated that it was a matter of fairness for all property owners to comply with BAR requirements.

Poul Hertel, Old Town resident, spoke in support of adhering to the BAR's policies.

Nils Kandelin, owner at 660 South Columbus Street, spoke in support of the application.

Kathleen Henning spoke in support of the application.

Marcia Brazda, owner at 664 South Columbus Street, spoke in support of the application.

Burt Grodnitzky, owner at 666 South Columbus Street, spoke in support of the application.

David Leary, owner at 642 South Columbus Street, spoke in support of the application.

### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

Dr. Fitzgerald stated that the vinyl windows with sandwich muntins looked terrible and did not match anything in the area. He noted that vinyl windows are ones that the Board wants to avoid having in the district and that the subject windows are, in fact, visible.

Mr. Neale noted that the windows were barely visible from the street and that since five years have elapsed, that it was acceptable to retain the windows in this particular case.

Mr. Carlin inquired as to whether there were storm windows currently in place. The applicant responded that there were not.

Mr. von Senden noted that two years ago the Board went through an intensive Modern & Sustainable Materials Work Group process to update standards and policies and that they again rejected vinyl windows for aesthetic and performance reasons. He stated that vinyl windows were never acceptable according to the Board's recently adopted window policy.

The Chairman called the question on the staff recommendation to deny the application and require the applicant to install replacement windows on the east elevation in conformance with the Board's Window Policy. The motion carried 3-2, with Mr. Neale and Mr. Carlin voting against the denial.

### **REASON**

The Board found that the policy regarding the use of vinyl windows at visible locations in the historic district was clear, noting that the use of vinyl windows was not acceptable anywhere in the district.

---

## **IV. WITHDRAWN ITEMS**

### **1. CASE BAR2012-0152**

Request for a revision to previously approved plans to partially demolish & capsule at  
**412 S Fairfax St**

APPLICANT: Alice Reid by G. Ray Lewis, Lewis & Associates

*Withdrawn prior to hearing*

### **2. CASE BAR2012-0153**

Request for a revision to previously approved plans for an addition & alterations at **412 S Fairfax St**

APPLICANT: Alice Reid by G. Ray Lewis, Lewis & Associates  
*Withdrawn prior to hearing*

3. **CASE BAR2012-0233**

Request for concept review of new construction at **220 S Union St**

APPLICANT: Carr Hospitality by Rust Orling Architecture

*Withdrawn prior to hearing at the applicant's request*

---

**V. OTHER BUSINESS**

1. [Alexandria Union Station National Register nomination](#)

**The Board endorsed the nomination, 5-0.**

The Board acknowledged the efforts of Ann Horowitz, local resident and volunteer, for her work on drafting the National Register nomination for Alexandria Union Station. ON a motion by Mr. von Senden, seconded by Dr. Fitzgerald, the Board made a finding of support for the nomination of Alexandria Union Station to be listed on the National Register of Historic Places and Virginia Landmarks Register.

2. 119 S Columbus St - Update on emergency demolition of a garage per Section 10-111 of the Zoning Ordinance.

**The Board noted the emergency demolition.**

3. An informal work session with public testimony regarding the proposed development at [220 S Union St by Carr Hospitality](#)

- a. [Applicable Regulations and Guidelines](#)
- b. [Appendix 2](#) of the *Alexandria Waterfront History Plan*
- c. [Existing Waterfront Resources Design Analysis](#)
- d. [Scale Model Excerpt of the Alexandria Waterfront Small Area Plan](#)

**The Board made informal comments but took no action.**

**SPEAKERS**

Ken Wire, speaking on behalf of the future applicant, gave a brief introduction and introduced his client, Austin Flasjer of Carr Hospitality.

Mark Orling, project architect, provided an overview of the proposal and the evolution of the building's design. He also provided an architectural context by explaining how the proposal reflected historic waterfront warehouse architecture and addressed the applicable standards and design guidelines.

Nate Macek, 724 Franklin Street and Chairman of the Waterfront Commission, speaking as an individual, thanked the Board for the opportunity to have a discussion. He was generally supportive of the project.

Kathryn Papp, 504 Cameron Street, referred to letters submitted by Roy Shannon and the National Trust for Historic Preservation field office. She stated she was not in support of the project.

David Olinger, 100 Prince Street, expressed concern about the size of the proposed hotel.

Hugh M. van Horn, 416 South Pitt Street, expressed concern about the size of the proposed hotel.

Poul Hertel, representing the Historic Alexandria Foundation, expressed concern regarding the process and also found that the mass and scale detracted from the historic buildings.

Felipe Gomez-Acebo, 100 Duke Street, spoke of the importance of transition in Old Town from residential to commercial buildings. The proposal does not appropriately transition.

John Gosling, 208 South Fayette Street and immediate past president of the Old Town Civic Association, spoke in opposition to the project, expressed concern about the proposal and recommended that additional ideas be explored.

Gail Rothrock, 209 Duke Street, representing herself and the Historic Alexandria Foundation Board, expressed concern regarding the proposed mass, scale and set back and also noted that Duke Street was a major pedestrian route to Point Lumley and the waterfront.

James McCall, Vice-Chair of the Alexandria Archaeology Commission, expressed concern regarding the size and massing of the proposed building. He was also concerned that historic sites along the waterfront be adequately identified and interpreted.

Bert Ely, 200 South Pitt Street, expressed concern about the proposal, finding it too large and impairing the surrounding neighborhood.

Lynn Hampton, 215 Park Road, spoke in support of the application finding the height and courtyard to be appropriate.

Dennis Auld, 215 Park Road, spoke in support of the application, finding the proposal consistent with the Design Guidelines and small area plan.

Gina Baum, 203 South Fairfax Street, spoke in support of the application and noted she appreciated the ability to provide public feedback early in the review process. She commented that the east side, or “back” of the building, will become more functional and important as the waterfront park evolves. She recommended that the building’s edges be softened to make it less block-like.

Deena de Montigny, 302 Prince Street, found the proposed scale and massing to be inappropriate and believed that the setbacks were not compatible.

Katy Cannady, 20 East Oak Street, stated that the project did not meet the small area plan objectives and that the proposal did not re-create the historic alleys and connections to the river. She expressed concern regarding the size of the project.

Bob Wood, 711 Potomac Street and member of the Waterfront Work Group, found the proposed bulk and mass to be disagreeable and noted that the area does need to be redeveloped.

Robert Pringle, 216 Wolfe Street, stated that the project was too big for a small area and found the design to be mediocre.

Van Van Fleet, 26 Wolfe Street, thought that the evening's work session was the first of its kind and spoke in opposition to the proposal.

Howard Bergman, 101 Quay Street, spoke in support of the warehouse design but found the proposal to be too big and massive and inconsistent with the Waterfront Plan.

Andrew MacDonald, 217 North Columbus Street, expressed thanks to the BAR and noted that the proposal was too big and not tied into the waterfront. He expressed concern about the proposed zoning.

Jaye Smith, 200 Duke Street, spoke in opposition to the project.

Julie Van Fleet, 26 Wolfe Street, expressed concern about the project citing the mass and scale as too big.

Boyd Walker, 1307 King Street, expressed concern about spot zoning and spoke in opposition.

Michael Hobbs, 419 Cameron Street, spoke in opposition to the project and noted that the zoning has implications for the architecture and design.

Roy Shannon, speaking on behalf of April Burke, Beth Gibney and Marie Kux, expressed concern about the process and recommended that the BAR hold another informal work session.

Mark Mueller, 414 South Royal Street, recommended that the applicant engage more with the citizens and look at the Morrison House as a compatible hotel design.

Mark Mueller, speaking on behalf of Beth Gibney of 300 South Lee Street, cited concerns that the proposed alley would become a trash alley and had concerns about reviewing a proposal without zoning in place.

Charles Hulfish, 325A South Washington Street, expressed concern with the proposed scale and scope of the project, finding that it would wall off the waterfront. He found



that the Duke Street elevation needed further work, as Duke provides access to the park and waterfront.

## **BOARD DISCUSSION**

Mr. Neale recused himself from this discussion.

Mr. von Senden noted that there were a lot of opportunities with this project. After reviewing the project, he was not as concerned with the proposed height as he initially was and compared the proposed hotel to other buildings on the waterfront, such as the Torpedo Factory. He found the L-shaped plan to be more successful and to improve the alley sight line. He thought that the entrance should recognize cars and allow for taxis. He noted that the sense of entry was very important at this site. He liked the 7/18/12 elevation for The Strand as it reflected historic structures. He thought the storefront on South Union Street was successful. He advised keeping the carriageway light and airy or it will become problematic. On the Duke Street elevation, he found the three segments to be positive but noted that the large shed dormer on the two-story Mansard roof was not successful.

Dr. Fitzgerald stated that he wanted to hear comments on the architecture but that the public provided few comments and that he would let the politicians determine the size of the project. He observed that if the citizens wanted a historic waterfront, which used to have huge, massive warehouse buildings, then the scheme has merit. He found the Duke Street elevation to be in need of substantial work. He recommended studying relocating the courtyard to the Duke Street elevation and to relocate the building services to the alley. He noted that a great architect was working on the project and that the design should reflect the historic waterfront.

Mr. Carlin noted that the east-west circulation has always been an important aspect of the Waterfront Plan to make the blocks more porous. Throughout the planning process, he has been fascinated by the model and noted that Council's approval had a specific statement with respect to a design that reflected the model. In 1961, the City underwent a downtown urban renewal and he does not want to see the same mistakes. He suggested turning the building's L-shaped plan to make the project more integrated and have fewer problems with loading. With respect to expectations related to massing, he noted that historic warehouses in this area had up to six stories. He found the current proposal to be a big box with mid-19<sup>th</sup>-century wallpaper and he suggested added balconies at the upper stories and angling the fifth floor with dormers.

Chairman Hulfish said he was opposed to the proposed size and mass. He noted that as the first project after the Waterfront Plan, special attention must be paid. He said that in other communities, waterfront buildings are iconic. He thought the project was too large but stated it should go farther in the City's review process.

## **VI. ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVALS**

The following items are shown for information only. Based on the Board's adopted policies, these have been approved by Staff since the previous Board meeting.

### **CASE BAR2012-00179**

Request for window replacement and repair at **821 Green St**

APPLICANT: Peter Knetemann by American Energy Master Inc., Bob Timbers

### **CASE BAR2012-00242**

Request for window rehabilitation and repair at **525 Queen St**

APPLICANT: Elizabeth Gossart

### **CASE BAR2012-00243**

Request for roof replacement at **323 N Pitt St**

APPLICANT: Sylvia Lukens

### **CASE BAR2012-00244**

Request for roof replacement at **816 S Fairfax St**

APPLICANT: Frank Kaczmarek

### **CASE BAR2012-00246**

Request for signage at **604 S Washington St**

APPLICANT: Shideh Passdar

### **CASE BAR2012-00247**

Request for antenna replacement at **1202 S Washington**

APPLICANT: T-Mobile for Virginia Department of Transportation

### **CASE BAR2012-00248**

Request for window replacement at **217 S Payne St**

APPLICANT: Robert Lennox and Hope Gibbs

### **CASE BAR2012-00249**

Request for roof replacement at **827 S Royal St**

APPLICANT: Nancy Mraz by NV Roofing

### **CASE BAR2012-00250**

Request for vents at **225 N Fairfax St**

APPLICANT: MPR Associated, Katie McHugh by Jeremy Fretts, Niles Bolton

### **CASE BAR2012-00251**

Request for signage at **1127 King St**

APPLICANT: David H. Holmes

**VII. ADJOURNMENT**

Chairman Hulfish adjourned the meeting at approximately 10:20pm.

Minutes submitted by,

Catherine Miliaras, Historic Preservation Planner  
Boards of Architectural Review